



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/418,818	10/15/1999	DAVID CHEUNG	AM1084D01/T9	9377
32588 75	90 01/15/2004		EXAMINER	
APPLIED MA	TERIALS, INC.		ZERVIGO	N, RUDY
2881 SCOTT B SANTA CLAR	LVD. M/S 2061 A. CA. 95050		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
DAINTA CEAR	11, 011 73000			

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/418,818	CHEUNG ET AL.	
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rudy Zervigon	1763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	S
THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2003 FAILS TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	I to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendme ppeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to nt which places the application	o a n in
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply of ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f).	expire later than SIX MONTHS from t	he mailing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the p fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	eriod of extension and the correspon late of the shortened statutory period ne Office later than three months afte	ding amount of the fee. The appropr for reply originally set in the final Offi	riate extension ice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be ente	red because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N			
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the applica issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tion in better form for appeal t	oy materially reducing or simpl	lifying the
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)v canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	vould be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely filed am	nendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ reque application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT p	lace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which were n	ewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clair			l an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as foll	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,9,10 and 44-62.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>_</u> ,		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)	approved or b) disapprov	ved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Sta	tement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: None of the pending claims are amended. The Examiner maintains all his positions stated in the Final Rejection. Applicant states that none of the cited references teach a computer readable program code for controlling the gas delivery system. However, as is stated in the Final Rejection, Felts et al (USPat. 4,888,199) teaches "a memory (column 10, lines 56-64) coupled to the controller comprising a computer readable program (column 16 - column 46-Felts et al 4,888,199) having a computer readable program embodied therein for directing operation of the substrate processing system, the computer readable program including a first (column 5, lines 16-40) set of computer instructions (column 16 -column 46 - Felts et al-199) for controlling the gas delivery system to introduce selected deposition gases (column 5, lines 17-40) into the process chamber at deposited gas flow rates". Further, Applicant states that none of the cited references teach "a first reflection from an interface between the photoresist layer and the antireflective layer of an exposure light is an odd number, but it is not an odd multiple, geater than one, of the wavelength of light to be used in a subsequent process operation on the layer.". However, the Examiner has asserted that Fourmun Lee teaches "means for forming a layer of photoresist (14, Fig.1;column 3, line 65- col.4, line 5) on the antireflective layer (13, Fig.1;column 3, lines 46-64), the antireflective layer (13, Fig.1;column 3, lines 46-64) having a thickness ("d", col.5, lines 10-15) and refractive index ("n", col.5, lines 10-15) such that a first reflection from an interface between the photoresist and the antireflective layer of an exposure light ("L", col.5, lines 10-15) will be a number/multiple (1/(2(n-1) - the inverse of all odd numbers, for n as integer; column 5, lines 10-15) multiplied by 180 (column 5, lines 15-25) out of phase with a second reflection from an interface between the antireflective layer and the substrate layer (12', 13'; column 5, lines 5-10) of the exposure light; and means for forming a photoresist pattern (column 5, lines 52-57) by exposing the photoresist layer to the exposure light and developing the exposed photoresist layer". Further, it was stated that "although Fourmun Lee teaches only n radians, where n=1, out of phase between consecutive areas 12' and 13', it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that odd multiples of radians is the same phase angle". The Examiner maintains all grounds of rejection.

> JEFFRIE R. LUND PRIMARY EXAMINER

July KN